

AVIATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES

MARCH 14, 2002; LONG BEACH AIRPORT



1.0 Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:04am by Immediate Past Chair Mr. Bob Trimborn, Santa Monica Airport.

2.0 Welcome and Introductions

Attendees were welcomed and introductions were made.

3.0: Public Comments

There were no public comments.

4.0: Routine Items

4.1 Approval of Minutes

The minutes from February 14, 2002 were approved with no comments. Mr. Ronald Kochevar, Los Angeles World Airports, motioned that the minutes be approved, Mr. William Ingraham, San Bernardino County Airports, seconded the motion.

4.2 ATAC Membership List and Contact Information

There are no new updates to the ATAC Contact List.

5.0 Project Review

There are no submissions for review.

6.0 Information Items

6.1 Jet Blue: Future Operation Plans at Long Beach

Ms. Lonnie Mitchell, Long Beach Airport, gave a presentation on JetBlue operations in Long Beach.

JetBlue currently has rights to 27 slots in Long Beach and all of them will be used by June 2003. They currently have 3 flights a day to New York JFK and will be expanding service to Washington DC Dulles on May 1, 2002. There are scheduled to be further operation increases in the late summer and fall. JetBlue is expecting to add 2 MAP over the next year and a half.

In an attempt to keep up with the growing operations, Long Beach is undergoing significant capital improvements. Phase 1 is expected to be completed by April of this year. It will include new temporary holdrooms, relocation of car rental facilities and remote parking capabilities.

Phase 2 will be completed in the Spring/Summer of 2003. It will include a completely new holdroom, an expanded security screening area, new holdroom concessions and a new baggage claim area.

The last phase, Phase 3 will provide significant parking upgrades by constructing a 4,000 slot structure that is close to the central terminal. The goal is to be able to accommodate 3.8 MAP. Other new construction will include new tenant parking, car rental offices and support services.

Overall, JetBlue has been continuing to increase their presence in Long Beach and shows no signs of slowing. JetBlue operates a fleet of 23 Airbus A-320's. At the next ATAC meeting held in Long Beach it is hoped that a JetBlue representative will be able to give a detailed description about their history and expansion efforts.

6.2 Methods for Collecting Landing Fees

Ronald Kochevar began the discussion by talking about LAX's problems with the collection of landing fees. His questions referred to how to decide who should be charged? And how the fees are collected? He mentioned that the FAA recommends charging all operations.

William Ingraham said that they had wrestled with the same issues in San Bernardino. He said that they had a difficult time collecting the fees but found that fuel flow charges were much more effective. It was a consensus that the best way to collect landing fees has been through the FBO's.

In dealing with fractional ownership of aircraft the best solution so far has been to collect fees the same as any other aircraft. The fee is collected on the aircraft, not the owner. By getting the aircraft ID number from good ATC data it is easy to assess fees.

Another option is to charge all operations that are Part 152 or higher. It is possible to charge a nominal fee of \$5 or \$10. An example is Branson, Missouri where every aircraft that lands is assessed a fee.

Bob Trimborn said that Santa Monica Airport does not receive any Federal funding for maintaining the airport. The airport hired a consultant to determine the annual cost of maintaining the pavement. The consultant examined how heavy aircraft impact pavement. Aircraft that are under 10,000lbs seem to have a negligible effect. Based on this data there was a sliding scale of fees developed based on the weight of the aircraft. The landing weight is the measure used. This scale was presented to Airport Commission and was deemed an acceptable way to charge fees to all aircraft. At the same time a city ordinance was passed that requires any aircraft that lands at the airport to fill out a registration card. This registration is facilitated through the FBO's. After registering the aircraft, landing fees are sent out. If they aren't paid it is a violation of Santa Monica Municipal Code.

Mr. Tad Dougherty, Ventura County, uses a system where they charge \$.75 per 1000lbs maximum gross take-off weight. When a plane lands airport staff records the identification numbers, time of day, etc. A statement is sent out to the owner requesting payment. The system has not had good returns because frequently the owner of the aircraft is a bank and not an individual. Eventually staff will talk with flight crews to find out who the correct party is that the statement should be sent to.

There is another idea in Ventura where the FBO's will collect the fees and then get a 20% share of the landing fee. There is then an incentive to collect a fee for the FBO's. William Ingraham mentioned that if you can tie the fee collection to an FBO that is an efficient way to collect the money.

Mr. Bill Cobb, Corona Airport, has further complications in the collecting of fees. Many pilots land in Corona because there are no landing fees. It would be detrimental to the airport concessions if a fee was charged. A suggestion was to charge on the fuel. Mr. Cobb said that this is not a viable option because the contract for the fuel is set and not up for renewal until at least 2008.

6.3 Hand Me Down Program

Mr. Ryan Hall, SCAG staff began the discussion by saying that this is an agenda item that had been suggested by Mr. Rick DeMel, Yucca Valley Municipal Airport. The issue is that the adopted Aviation Component of the 2001 RTP calls for a decentralized system of airports in the SCAG region. However, many of the smaller airports in the region do not have the funding that is necessary to pay for much needed capital improvements. At the same time the larger commercial airports are constantly undergoing capital improvement projects. Items such as runway lights, jet bridges, etc may be torn out and disposed of although they may still be in proper working condition and fully operational.

If these capital items could be salvaged and donated to the smaller airports it could be a win-win situation for all parties. SCAG staff would like to have ATAC discuss this possibility and have a brainstorming session on how this could be accomplished.

The solution may be as simple as having a form that the larger airport fills out and then is posted somehow so smaller airports can express interest.

Bob Trimbora mentioned that in some cases the items themselves are not what is expensive, but that the actual installation is what is costly. In that case this program would offer little savings.

The number and type of items that could be handed down is also limited. In some cases the technology of the items being replaced may be beyond the capabilities of a smaller airport. Also, things like jet bridges are not replaced until their shelf life is completely over.

At Corona Airport, Mr. Bill Cobb, mentioned that they do not receive any Federal funding so this type of program would be extremely helpful. They are currently in a situation where they need runway lighting.

Ms. Paula McHargue, Los Angeles World Airports, suggested that the forum for these items could be the CalTrans aviation website. This could be set up like classified ads where smaller airports could electronically post their capital needs. There was some consensus that this could be a very feasible option. This would also be statewide so the market for opportunity could extend beyond the SCAG region.

6.4 California AB 2333

Mr. Michael Armstrong, SCAG staff, began by giving an overview of California Assembly Bill AB 2333. AB 2333 is authored by Mr. George Nakano, and is intended to enforce compliance of the adopted Aviation Component of the 2001 RTP. If the four urbanized counties in the SCAG region did not conform to the adopted plan then they would lose all state highway and transit funding. SCAG has not taken a position on this legislation but there are numerous implications for the SCAG region.

If a county is not in compliance and loses its funding it could have a negative impact on the other components of the RTP. The Bill is primarily designed to force Orange County to approve aviation use of El Toro. This issue has become moot with the recent passage of Measure W by Orange County voters.

Another issue is what is 'timely implementation' as mentioned in the Bill. Remote airports have invested money in order to attract new service but have been

unsuccessful at this time. This raises a number of issues in how the legislation would be enforced and implemented.

The adopted Aviation Plan comes close to achieving a fair share of supply but it is difficult to force the market to conform to these constraints.

The Committee was in general consent that the Bill has significant implementation issues and that the compliance by the counties is difficult to enforce. Bob Trimbom ended the discussion by saying that this discussion may be premature because there is no certainty that the legislation will progress anywhere.

8.0 Legislative Report

8.1 Significant Aviation related Legislation Before the California Legislature

Ryan Hall said that the main item of significance was AB 2333 which Michael Armstrong just discussed.

8.2 Significant Aviation related Legislation Before the United States Legislature

Ryan Hall began the discussion by talking about the U.S. Senate Bill S 633, the Aviation Delay Prevention Act. The Act would require the Department of Transportation (DOT) to identify and initiate expansion at large hub airports that experience delays "that significantly affect the national air transportation system". Specifically, the bill would streamline the environmental review process for airport expansion projects thus expediting construction related to airport capacity at various large hub airports.

The key issue for the SCAG region is that this legislation could force LAX to expand even though the region has an adopted aviation plan for a decentralized airport network. SCAG has taken an oppose unless amended stance. SCAG is asking that the legislation be changed to be not applicable to regions that have aviation plans.

A comment was made that the trend for decentralized airports is nice, but that large hubs are still a necessity. This legislation takes a careful reading to fully understand the implications. It was agreed that the penalties of withholding PFC's should be withdrawn.

One of the key goals of the legislation is to speed up the environmental review process that can keep projects held up for so long. Streamlining the environmental process will keep the review process hopefully to five years.

Michael Armstrong did mention that this legislation was authored before September 11, 2001. This legislation may have taken a back burner since that time.

The Members of ATAC requested an Informal Discussion on the Impacts of Measure W in Orange County:

Michael Armstrong began the discussion by saying that Measure W in Orange County was passed by the voters on March 5, 2002. The Measure rezones the site of the El Toro Marine Base from aviation use to a 'great park'. SCAG staff was asked to look at how the vote would affect the adopted aviation plan and also look at different scenarios.

The economic impact to the region of no El Toro will be a loss of 135,000 jobs and \$18 Billion. Some of the impact will be redistributed over the base, so the real loss is only about \$9 Billion. The real question is where the demand for El Toro will be redistributed.

The attention will now have to be put on Ontario. Much of the overflow from LAX will have to be put on Ontario. How do you maximize the efficiency of Ontario and turn it into an international airport?

Cargo is going to be a big issue in the near future. There are now discussions on where cargo demand will shift too. Prior to the passage of Measure W many cargo carriers were undecided as to where to invest money for capital projects. Now that El Toro is less likely there may be some movement from cargo carriers. Ontario may now have to focus more attention on passengers and some cargo operations may be able to move to San Bernardino, March, or Palmdale. SCAG is hopeful that LAWA will address these issues in the new Ontario Master Plan.

Some of the issues associated with a much larger Ontario are ground access and highway/transit funding. More importantly, without El Toro, how can Ontario serve Orange County? There is a possibility that MAGLEV could be used to directly connect Irvine to Ontario, and with HOV lanes could also be used to get Orange County passengers to Ontario with remote terminals.

SCAG is starting an airspace analysis and an expanded Ontario along with possible cargo at San Bernardino could have some airspace implications that need to be looked at. The airspace analysis should be easier without El Toro because one of the potential airspace problems involved conflicts between El Toro and John Wayne.

There is a possible silver lining in Measure W. The passage of the Measure will speed the maturation of Ontario as an international airport and there will be renewed cargo interest in new airports in the Inland Empire as well as Palmdale. Also, the jobs/housing balance situation in the region could benefit. The

development of El Toro would have created jobs in already job rich Orange County and there will still be a lack of housing in the county. However, should the land be auctioned there is a possibility that the land may be turned into job creating commercial and industrial uses.

The last issue is San Diego demand. Without El Toro the share of demand from northern San Diego County will have to be distributed elsewhere. San Diego is currently undergoing a site selection process that is evaluating 38 sites. Since the passage of Measure W, San Diego's site selection process is taking on a new urgency. The county can no longer look at El Toro to solve their aviation problems.

9.0 Miscellaneous Items

9.1 GAO Report and Summary

There were no formal comments. ATAC found the GAO report very interesting and they were glad it was included in the agenda.

9.2 Press Clippings

The press clippings were attached to ATAC agenda. There were no comments.

10.0 Public Comments

Desert Resorts Regional Airport in Thermal, CA is having an open house to celebrate the opening of a new 8,500ft runway. The open house is April 8, for more information call 800-984-1000.

11.0 Set Next Meeting Location and Topics of Discussion

The April meeting is scheduled for Thursday April 11, 2002 from 10am to 12Noon at the Chino Airport.

The May meeting is tentatively scheduled for Thursday May 9, 2002 at Ontario International Airport, from 10am- 12Noon.

An action item for the April meeting will be to vote on having ATAC as bi-monthly meetings. With bi-monthly meetings the Chair will have the option of convening monthly as they see fit. Depending on the outcome of this item, the schedule for future meetings will be set.

12. Adjournment

Bob Trimborn adjourned the meeting at 11:45am.